

TELEGRAM

ROUTING TELEGRAM Department of State

03572

INDICATE COLLECT
FACSIMILE

TOP SECRET

31

Classification

SS

ACTION: USUN, New York PRIORITY 12888
INIT DISTRIBUTION - S/S

Ref: USUN's 1780.

Nov 16 2 46 PM '62

1119

1. Thoroughly agree with your reaction to UN working paper (URTEL 1795).
2. As we read proposals, Castro would get internationally verified assurance against invasion in exchange for verified removal and non-reintroduction of nuclear weapons in Cuba. Concept of UN inspection of non-invasion assurance goes well beyond exchange of letters between President and Khrushchev. We believe, as apparently do number of Latin Americans, that Castro would be exacting an unacceptably high price if we were to agree to SYG's proposal. At any rate, do not believe we should encourage SYG to believe that we might fall back to position of discussing internationally verified assurance against invasion of Cuba.
3. It is clear that three different kinds of verification are mixed up in Thant's proposal and clear distinctions should be made between them:
 - A. Short-term problem: verification of withdrawal of offensive weapons from Cuba;
 - B. Longer range safeguards against reintroduction of offensive weapons into Cuba; and
 - C. Longer range safeguards against invasion of Cuba and broader schemes for maintenance of peace in the Caribbean.

AMERICAN EMBASSY

Havana-Cuba

AMERICAN EMBASSY
Havana-Cuba

AMERICAN EMBASSY

AMERICAN EMBASSY
Havana-Cuba

AMERICAN EMBASSY

AMERICAN EMBASSY

~~TOP SECRET~~~~Classification~~

4. Verification is required performance under the Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding, i.e., to make sure that offensive weapons systems have been dismantled and removed from Cuba. There is no question of reciprocity or mutuality here. The Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding had to do with offensive weapons in Cuba, and verification must take place in Cuba alone.

5. When it comes to safeguards against the reintroduction of offensive weapons, the problem is primarily a matter for action inside Cuba. The President's letter to Khrushchev (OCT 27) indicated he understood that an agreement not to reintroduce offensive weapons systems into Cuba would be undertaken with suitable safeguards. With respect to nuclear weapons, this might well be broadened to involve mutuality and reciprocity with other Latin American states (but not the US); indeed, this is just what is envisaged in the Brazilian demilitarized zone proposal.

6. Cubans and Soviets are evidently raising a new third problem: safeguards to insure that US and other OAS countries abide by whatever non-invasion assurances are to be given. Every attempt to think through just what would be inspected, by whom and where, in such a safeguards system, makes clear that this is a mare's nest, full of undefinable concepts and ineterminate geography.

7. What is wrong with the UN proposal is that it collapses together all three of these proposals (verification of weapons removal; safeguards against reintroduction; safeguards against invasion of Cuba).

8. We should set this point out clearly in our final proposal to the UN and that should point out above. We should insist on strict separation of the three measurable proposals into non-nuclear weapons removal, Kennedy-Khrushchev, and

~~TOP SECRET~~

Classification

most rapid possible progress toward some system of safeguards against reintroduction of offensive weapons (PARA 5, above) which is clearly part of Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding.

9. Therefore we should push for proposal of Latin American demilitarized zone. But even here, there is no point in pushing this bird until there is some indication that Cuba will agree to become a part of it. Brazilians have been sounding Cubans out on this; is there any news from that quarter?

10. We are developing here a planning paper showing how a general Caribbean security system might be established, if the attitude of the Cubans mutate in a direction that makes it useful to discuss that subject at all. Essence any such plan would be that UN presence in Cuba is best assurance against invasion of Cuba.

11. Re McCloy suggestion of reference telegram. While it is obviously desirable to tackle before long problem of eliminating Soviet military personnel from Cuba, believe it would be confusing to throw it into current negotiations before we have secured adequate performance from Soviets and Cubans even on the original understanding between Kennedy-Khrushchev.

12. In view hardening stand by Soviets and Cubans, we believe SDC should be reminded that only real alternative to their unacceptable proposals would be necessity for us to deal with the continuing threat in other ways.

END

2010 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176

2025 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176